Court Automation Coordinating Committee Monitoring Update

Michael P. Pollard, Chair

COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY

September 24, 2010

Recap of May 6 COT Discussion

- Drop task-level process associated with dashboards
- Renew focus on tracking interdependencies among automation projects across all trial courts
- Coordinate limited jurisdiction large volume courts' CMS implementations in best interest of courts as a whole
- Should CACC monitor beyond development phase to better identify relationship impacts, coordinate dependencies, and capitalize on lessons learned?
- Requested to return to discuss the approach taken

Accomplishments Since May 6

- Held "Summit at the Summit" June 17 to strategize
- Shared representative with PACC (Kip Anderson)
- Added monitoring of probation projects
- Abandoned task-level dashboard with R/Y/G voting to discovering and discussing dependencies at the business deliverable level
- Created and refined monitoring tool to focus members on project relationships
- Began with AOC projects; planning to spread updates to next layer of projects

Monitoring Dependencies Example

Summary

- CACC has acted on COT's direction and fundamentally reorganized its monitoring strategy
- Tool exists to effectively expose and track interrelationships among automation projects within the trial courts
- CACC relies on project managers in the courts for honest, timely updates

- Any Questions from COT members?

Requested Motion

- Direct CACC to continue its monitoring strategy to track interrelationships among automation projects within the trial courts and obtain updates from court project managers, as requested.